



20 Church Street  
Hartford, CT 06103-1221  
p: 860-725-6200 f: 860-278-3802  
hinckleyallen.com

**Timothy S. Hollister**  
**(860) 331-2823 (Direct)**  
**(860) 558-1512 (Cell)**  
**thollister@hinckleyallen.com**

**VIA E-FILING TO HOUSING COMMITTEE**

February 27, 2023

Senator Marilyn Moore and  
Rep. Geoff Luxenberg, Co-Chairs, and  
Members of the Housing Committee  
Legislative Office Building, Toom 2700  
Hartford, CT 06106

Re: **Update of Facts Regarding General Statutes § 8-30g; Opposition of Raised Bill No. 5777 and Committee Bill No. 5236**

Dear Senator Moore, Rep. Luxenberg, and Housing Committee Members:

I am a land use attorney. I have been involved with General Statutes § 8-30g since its adoption in 1989. I served as a member of the Second Blue Ribbon Commission in 1999, and I have reported updates about § 8-30g to this Committee, the Planning and Development Committee, and other interested legislators during each of the past 32 years. Today I am also Co-Chair of the Affordable Housing Plans Working Group, part of the Commission on Connecticut's Future and Development, which in fact will be making its presentation next Monday, March 6.

This letter has two parts. The first is an update on § 8-30g. The second is opposition comment regarding Raised Bill No. 6777 and Committee Bill No. 5236, each of which fundamentally misunderstands § 8-30g and offers an unworkable and unjustified proposal.

**Section 8-30g Update**

The following is an update of § 8-30g information sheet that, pre-pandemic, was presented annual for many years to this Committee.

1. **Housing Production.** The Affordable Housing Land Use Appeals Act, General Statutes § 8-30g, was adopted in 1989 at the recommendation of a Blue Ribbon Commission that documented municipal land use commission resistance to lower cost housing proposals, despite rapidly escalating prices that were putting most of Connecticut's homes out of reach of moderate and low income families. During its 33 years as Connecticut law, § 8-30g has spurred the

approval and construction or preservation of workforce housing that would not otherwise have occurred. Section 8-30g has spurred creation of "assisted housing," including housing privately developed with some amount of governmental assistance, such as CHFA financing. In addition, since the predominant model under § 8-30g has been "set aside" development, in which 30 percent (originally 20 percent, moved to 25 percent in 1995 and 30 percent in 2000) of the total units are price-restricted and the rest are market-rate, the affordable units created in compliance with § 8-30g have brought with them the construction of several thousand market-priced but less expensive homes. A March 2022 analysis prepared by my firm (copy attached) estimates that since 1990, § 8-30g has resulted in the creation of 8,500 rent or price-restricted units, and 18,000 units that are market-rate but lower cost.

2. **Success Stories.** Across the state, there are numerous § 8-30g recent approvals, *without court appeals*, of nicely-designed, appropriately-situated, mixed-income developments, such as: 176 units on Security Drive, Avon; 74 units at the intersection of Routes 74 and 83 in Glastonbury; and 46 units on Smith Lane in Orange. A Low Income Housing Tax Credit development, Oak Tree Village, is a now built and occupied in Griswold. In several towns, multi-family rental developments approved under § 8-30g are among the largest "tax positive" properties on municipal Grand Lists.

3. **Established, Understood Standards.** After 33 years, the standards used for evaluation of § 8-30g proposals are well-established and clear to judges, municipalities, land use boards, applicants, and consultants.

4. **Documented Denial Reasons Upheld In Court.** Whenever a municipal zoning commission has effectively documented a substantial health or safety reason to deny an affordable housing proposal, such as a lack of sewage disposal capacity, water supply, water quality impacts, or lack of emergency vehicle access, the courts have upheld that denial. The courts have also upheld denials when other grounds have been compelling, such as open space preservation.

5. **Moratorium Provisions Are Working.** Moratorium provisions are working as intended. The incentive point system, which rewards towns for housing development that meets § 8-30g standards, with bonus points for family and rental housing, has in fact been utilized by towns that are unlikely to reach 10 percent affordability. Moratoria have been achieved in Berlin (twice), Bethel, Darien (twice), Farmington, New Canaan, Milford, Ridgefield, Westport, Trumbull, South Windsor, Wilton, Brookfield, and Suffield.

6. **Protection Of Municipalities.** In 2000, the statute was amended to provide greater procedural protections for towns and to assure that § 8-30g developments provide a level of affordability not otherwise available in the communities covered by the statute. The amendments have worked as intended.

7. **Workforce Housing Need: Never Greater.** The need for housing that is affordable has never been greater. Numerous recent reports have documented the need for lower-cost, multi-family rental. The Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies, in its 2022 “State of the Nation’s Housing” report, said that “[high] housing costs have added to the pressure on household budgets, especially among lower-income households and households of color.” *The reasons for which § 8-30g was adopted in 1989-90 are as compelling today as they were then, and even more so.*

8. **Municipal Services And Fiscal Impacts.** In many cases, objectors to § 8-30g applications have predicted increases in crime, taxes, traffic, pollution, etc. These dire predictions have *not* come to pass. In fact, municipal leaders – First Selectmen, Police Chiefs, School Superintendents, and Town Planners –praise § 8-30g developments as a social and fiscal benefit.

9. **Design Standards.** A commission may consider design and architectural review factors in an § 8-30g application, in the same manner as in other applications. Moreover, zoning commissions may raise design and architectural issues under the fourth prong of § 8-30g review, which requires commissions to identify "reasonable changes" to a rejected application that would result in its approval of the application. In addition, a commission can approve an § 8-30g application subject to design or architectural changes, which under § 8-30g can be upheld if they do not adversely affect the affordability of the affordable units. Design is also affected by the court-imposed requirement that, in a set aside development, affordable units be "comparable" to market-rate units.

10. **Reducing Economic And Racial Barriers.** One of § 8-30g's original purposes was to reduce economic and racial barriers. While these results are difficult to measure, there is no doubt that § 8-30g has resulted in greater housing opportunities for lower income households in suburban communities. In the recently approved Buckingham Place Glastonbury development, moderate and low income households will be leased at net monthly rents (across one and two bedroom units) ranging from \$929 to \$1,413, and for households with incomes ranging from \$50,670 to \$81,072.

### **Opposition to Raised Bill No. 6777**

This bill is difficult to understand, but its apparent proposal is to require every town that is not exempt from § 8-30g to provide, by ordinance, a tax abatement to every person who is 65 or older, owns a single-family home, has an annual income below “regional” (area) median income, and imposes a long-term deed restriction on his/her home, if the home is appraised in the current tax year at a price that is affordable to a household earning 80 percent or less of the regional/area median. For any property whose taxes are so abated, the town may claim two Housing Unit Equivalent (HUE) points toward a four-year moratorium from § 8-30g.



This proposal is fundamentally flawed and unworkable, for at least three reasons:

1. The tax abatements are revocable (*see* Lines 59-62). So twenty homeowners could subject their homes to the price restriction; the town could claim 40 HUE points and earn a moratorium; and the next year the owners could revoke the restrictions!
2. The bill awards moratorium points without the town having to produce a single affordable unit.
3. The current year appraised value of a single family home is not a maximum price restriction that complies with § 8-30g, whose formula includes a family size adjustment, selection of a mortgage interest rate, and calculation of utility costs, so this bill uses a metric that is incomplete and not compliant with § 8-30g.

Raised Bill No. 6777 should be summarily rejected.

### **Opposition to Committee Bill No. 5326**

This bill's Section 1 would apparently count on the § 8-30g Ten Percent List of towns exempt from § 8-30g as maintained by the Department of Housing, housing units that are *not* formally deed restricted, but whose current assessed value, if offered as the sale price of the unit/home, and assuming a 30 year mortgage and an "average prime rate" mortgage, would result in a monthly mortgage payment that is affordable to a household earning 80 percent of median income as defined in § 8-30g.

This bill should be rejected for a least three reasons:

1. The bill would require all towns and the Department of Housing, *annually* to identify *every home in the entire state* whose current assessed value is in the range where, if offered for sale, it would be "affordable"; *calculate a fictitious mortgage interest rate*; and *assume a sale, even though the property is not proposed for sale*.

One of the key characteristics of the Department of Housing's Ten Percent List that makes it administratively feasible is that it counts readily available data that are easily counted annually or does not have to be calculated or re-verified annually: CHFA mortgages, rental assistance certificates, units subject to long-term CHFA/DOH/Federal government financing program rules, and "set aside" units subject to long-term deed restrictions. *This bill proposes an annual, fictitious, subjective, and not verifiable calculation of hundreds of thousands of housing units.*

2. The § 8-30g Ten Percent List is based on legally-binding, long-term restrictions. This bill contains no such objectivity, feasibility, certainty, or continuity, as to these parameters.

Senator Marilyn Moore and  
Rep. Geoff Luxenberg, Chairs et al  
February 27, 2022  
Page 5

3. The Department of Housing could not possibly administratively review or verify claims of qualifying units, nor could municipalities, provide accurate data.

4. Towns should be aware that this bill creates an incentive for towns to lower assessed values, which will reduce municipal property tax revenue.

5. The bill ignores the fact that municipal tax valuations are periodic, every five years, which creates a guaranteed disconnect between our property tax system and the mechanics of this bill.

Proposals to “count housing on the Ten Percent List that is of low value, even if it is not deed-restricted” have been made annually since § 8-30g was adopted in 1990– and have been rejected annually for the reasons stated above.

Thank you for your attention.

Very truly yours,



Timothy S. Hollister

TSH:afz

Enclosure



## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** March 2, 2022

**TO:** Interested Parties

**FROM:** Tim Hollister and Andrea Gomes at Hinckley Allen, Hartford Office

**RE:** Approximately how many housing units has General Statutes § 8-30g produced since its enactment in 1990?

---

This week, the General Assembly will consider a bill to direct a study of § 8-30g. Meanwhile, towns are drafting affordable housing plans, due in June 2022, as directed by Public Act 21-29, and the Commission on Connecticut's Future and Development will be assessing those municipal plans and preparing guidance on how to draft them. In addition, the Department of Housing has issued a new § 8-30g Ten Percent List. Amid this confluence of events, a question has arisen on the Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association listerv about an updated count of housing production attributable to § 8-30g. We decided to take a stab at an updated count.

The caveat is that, 32 years after § 8-30g's enactment, it is only possible to estimate how many housing units are "attributable" to § 8-30g. Residential developments are approved and built for a multiplicity of reasons. Also, in 32 years, there have been 8-30g developments from the 1990's, when the affordability time period for "set aside" units was 20 or 25 years, whose restrictions have now expired, as well as building demolitions, and a few instances where unit count reporting to DOH by town was discovered to need an adjustment. Noting these obstacles, however, we offer the following analysis:

Our primary method has been to compare the 1992 Ten Percent List to the new 2021 List (both attached). The 1992 List was the second one issued, and was more complete and accurate than the first 1991 List. From these two Lists, we can glean the following:

The 2021 List shows, statewide, 5,406 "Deed Restricted Units," which means units with income and rent or sale price restrictions that comply with § 8-30g. It is reasonable to attribute almost all of these units to § 8-30g, because as a legal matter, § 8-30g units did not exist before the statute was enacted in 1990.

It should be noted that about 55 percent of these units are located in municipalities that are currently exempt from § 8-30g, but comparing the 1992 and 2022 Lists, it is evident that

many of the units created in these now-exempt towns are units that helped move previously non-exempt towns (Norwalk, Danbury, and West Haven, for example) to exempt status (and to make sure they preserve their exempt status). Put another way, in 1992, only 26 towns were exempt, while 31 are today, and 19 of the 31 now-exempt towns are between 10.0 and 15.9 percent, providing an incentive to maintain and improve current affordable unit levels. (Note: § 8-30g requires the denominator of the Ten Percent List to be based on the most recent federal census, so the next Ten Percent List will have a new set of denominators.)

If we add in the approximately 150-200 units in § 8-30g developments whose affordability restrictions have expired, then 5,550-5,600 is a reasonable estimate of "deed restricted" units since 1990.

The next observation is that most of these 5,550-5,600 affordable units are in 30 percent set-aside developments, because the other § 8-30g category, "assisted housing," is reported separately. If we consider 5,500 units as 30 percent of the total, that equates to more than 18,000 market rate units (and though not deed restricted, generally less expensive) approved as part of the § 8-30g process.

As noted, the other § 8-30g category is "assisted housing," meaning units built with some form of governmental assistance. Thus, this category includes units financed with federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits; state rental assistance programs; some form of financial help from DOH or CHFA; other federal programs; and municipal housing trust funds. The Ten Percent List counts "Government Assisted" and "Tenant Rental Assistance" as "assisted housing."

Noting that government housing programs have evolved over 32 years, the 1992 Ten Percent List shows 112,276 government assisted units, and the 2021 list shows 141,942 units, an increase of just under 30,000 units. It is not possible to calculate with precision how many of these 30,000 units were constructed due to § 8-30g, but based on our knowledge of § 8-30g approvals that have been government-assisted, ten percent is a conservative estimate. That would add 3,000 affordable units to the overall count.

(Note: We have omitted consideration of the Ten Percent List category of "single family" CHFA/USDA mortgages, because although these are counted on the Ten Percent List, the income and sale price qualification of these programs generally exceed § 8-30g limits. Also, these are merely financing programs.)

Therefore, in total, conservative and reasonable estimates are that § 8-30g has spurred the creation of about 8,500 units that are affordable in compliance with § 8-30g or an applicable government assistance program; and about 18,000 market-rate units in set aside developments constructed pursuant to § 8-30g. Again, these numbers are proposed as orders of magnitude, not exact counts.

We welcome comments and observations as to how the accuracy of these estimates might be improved. Meanwhile, we hope this analysis will help clarify this quantitative question about § 8-30g and assist in the discussions presently underway.

2021 Affordable Housing Appeals List - Exempt Municipalities							
Town	2010 Census	2021 Gov Assisted	2021 Tenant Rental Assistance	2021 Single Family CHFA/USDA Mortgages	2021 Deed Restricted Units	2021 Total Assisted Units	2021 Percent Affordable
Ansonia	8,148	366	799	138	0	1,303	15.99%
Bloomfield	9,019	574	114	303	0	991	10.99%
Bridgeport	57,012	6,949	4351	815	19	12,134	21.28%
Bristol	27,011	2,006	950	1,031	0	3,987	14.76%
Danbury	31,154	1,652	1258	465	221	3,596	11.54%
Derby	5,849	275	314	102	0	691	11.81%
East Hartford	21,328	1,593	809	964	0	3,366	15.78%
East Windsor	5,045	559	37	102	0	698	13.84%
Enfield	17,558	1,360	221	592	7	2,180	12.42%
Groton	17,978	3,727	103	335	10	4,175	23.22%
Hartford	51,822	10,733	8,723	1,441	0	20,897	40.32%
Killingly	7,592	467	152	167	0	786	10.35%
Manchester	25,996	1,871	979	872	32	3,754	14.44%
Meriden	25,892	1,976	1,360	956	11	4,303	16.62%
Middletown	21,223	3,116	1,129	486	25	4,756	22.41%
New Britain	31,226	3,017	1,583	1,109	100	5,809	18.60%
New Haven	54,967	9,652	7,142	891	457	18,142	33.01%
New London	11,840	1,600	490	475	101	2,666	22.52%
North Canaan	1,587	148	0	14	0	162	10.21%
Norwalk	35,415	2,245	1,546	385	667	4,843	13.67%
Norwich	18,659	2,296	796	516	0	3,608	19.34%
Plainfield	6,229	377	196	191	4	768	12.33%
Putnam	4,299	413	63	70	0	546	12.70%
Stamford	50,573	4,219	2,073	383	1270	7,945	15.71%
Torrington	16,761	912	328	513	17	1,770	10.56%
Vernon	13,896	1,509	470	348	12	2,339	16.83%
Waterbury	47,991	5,385	3,156	1,597	48	10,186	21.22%
West Haven	22,446	1,024	2,119	395	0	3,538	15.76%
Winchester	5,613	350	170	84	0	604	10.76%
Windham	9,570	1,776	597	338	0	2,711	28.33%
Windsor Locks	5,429	297	154	224	0	675	12.43%
2021 Affordable Housing Appeals List - Non-Exempt Municipalities							
Town	2010 Census	2021 Gov Assisted	2021 Tenant Rental Assistance	2021 Single Family CHFA/USDA Mortgages	2021 Deed Restricted Units	2021 Total Assisted Units	2020 Percent Affordable
Andover	1,317	24	1	29	0	54	4.10%
Ashford	1,903	32	0	32	0	64	3.36%
Avon	7,389	244	21	36	1	302	4.09%
Barkhamsted	1,589	0	5	21	0	26	1.64%
Beacon Falls	2,509	0	4	38	0	42	1.67%
Berlin	8,140	556	50	124	4	734	9.02%
Bethany	2,044	0	2	11	0	13	0.64%
Bethel	7,310	192	30	132	87	441	6.03%
Bethlehem	1,575	24	0	5	0	29	1.84%
Bolton	2,015	0	2	29	0	31	1.54%
Bozrah	1,059	0	3	27	0	30	2.83%
Branford	13,972	243	73	152	9	477	3.41%
Bridgewater	881	0	0	1	0	1	0.11%



Brookfield	6,562	155	22	97	77	351	5.35%
Brooklyn	3,235	232	10	63	0	305	9.43%
Burlington	3,389	27	0	44	0	71	2.10%
Canaan	779	1	3	4	1	9	1.16%
Canterbury	2,043	76	1	61	0	138	6.75%
Canton	4,339	251	31	48	32	362	8.34%
Chaplin	988	0	2	35	0	37	3.74%
Cheshire	10,424	258	23	88	17	386	3.70%
Chester	1,923	23	4	15	0	42	2.18%
Clinton	6,065	105	8	60	0	173	2.85%
Colchester	6,182	364	37	132	4	537	8.69%
Colebrook	722	0	1	6	1	8	1.11%
Columbia	2,308	24	2	57	0	83	3.60%
Cornwall	1,007	28	2	6	0	36	3.57%
Coventry	5,099	103	4	120	20	247	4.84%
Cromwell	6,001	212	9	173	0	394	6.57%
Darien	7,074	161	14	2	104	281	3.97%
Deep River	2,096	26	6	32	0	64	3.05%
Durham	2,694	36	1	26	0	63	2.34%
East Granby	2,152	72	2	42	0	116	5.39%
East Haddam	4,508	73	2	59	0	134	2.97%
East Hampton	5,485	64	7	83	25	179	3.26%
East Haven	12,533	542	167	274	0	983	7.84%
East Lyme	8,458	396	19	86	19	520	6.15%
Eastford	793	0	0	10	0	10	1.26%
Easton	2,715	0	0	3	15	18	0.66%
Ellington	6,665	260	5	104	0	369	5.54%
Essex	3,261	75	2	16	16	109	3.34%
Fairfield	21,648	231	139	56	182	608	2.81%
Farmington	11,106	470	115	128	155	868	7.82%
Franklin	771	27	2	19	0	48	6.23%
Glastonbury	13,656	604	49	108	2	763	5.59%
Goshen	1,664	1	1	4	0	6	0.36%
Granby	4,360	85	2	46	5	138	3.17%
Greenwich	25,631	879	458	13	38	1,388	5.42%
Griswold	5,118	222	57	144	0	423	8.26%
Guilford	9,596	186	10	32	0	228	2.38%
Haddam	3,504	22	1	27	0	50	1.43%
Hamden	25,114	1,048	818	473	4	2,343	9.33%
Hampton	793	0	1	11	0	12	1.51%
Hartland	856	2	0	6	0	8	0.93%
Harwinton	2,282	22	6	34	5	67	2.94%
Hebron	3,567	58	3	44	0	105	2.94%
Kent	1,665	58	4	4	0	66	3.96%
Killingworth	2,598	0	0	16	5	21	0.81%
Lebanon	3,125	26	3	76	0	105	3.36%
Ledyard	5,987	32	12	210	6	260	4.34%
Lisbon	1,730	2	0	58	0	60	3.47%
Litchfield	3,975	140	3	30	19	192	4.83%
Lyme	1,223	0	0	5	8	13	1.06%
Madison	8,049	90	3	9	33	135	1.68%
Mansfield	6,017	175	128	80	2	385	6.40%
Marlborough	2,389	24	0	24	0	48	2.01%
Middlebury	2,892	77	5	18	20	120	4.15%
Middlefield	1,863	30	3	18	1	52	2.79%
Milford	23,074	728	244	168	74	1,214	5.26%
Monroe	6,918	35	5	44	8	92	1.33%
Montville	7,407	81	54	247	0	382	5.16%
Morris	1,314	20	3	5	0	28	2.13%
Naugatuck	13,061	493	305	344	0	1,142	8.74%

New Canaan	7,551	175	19	5	21	220	2.91%
New Fairfield	5,593	0	2	53	17	72	1.29%
New Hartford	2,923	12	3	47	15	77	2.63%
New Milford	11,731	319	41	153	20	533	4.54%
Newington	13,011	531	128	437	36	1,132	8.70%
Newtown	10,061	134	7	80	32	253	2.51%
Norfolk	967	21	1	5	0	27	2.79%
North Branford	5,629	62	14	45	0	121	2.15%
North Haven	9,491	393	51	85	23	552	5.82%
North Stonington	2,306	0	1	21	6	28	1.21%
Old Lyme	5,021	64	2	14	3	83	1.65%
Old Saybrook	5,602	52	15	21	73	161	2.87%
Orange	5,345	46	10	10	6	72	1.35%
Oxford	4,746	36	3	26	0	65	1.37%
Plainville	8,063	205	46	282	22	555	6.88%
Plymouth	5,109	178	20	174	0	372	7.28%
Pomfret	1,684	32	2	13	0	47	2.79%
Portland	4,077	185	90	64	0	339	8.31%
Preston	2,019	40	5	38	0	83	4.11%
Prospect	3,474	0	4	43	45	92	2.65%
Redding	3,811	0	2	15	0	17	0.45%
Ridgefield	9,420	175	6	26	79	286	3.04%
Rocky Hill	8,843	235	62	157	0	454	5.13%
Roxbury	1,167	19	0	5	0	24	2.06%
Salem	1,635	0	4	30	0	34	2.08%
Salisbury	2,593	24	0	2	14	40	1.54%
Scotland	680	0	1	28	0	29	4.26%
Seymour	6,968	262	29	98	0	389	5.58%
Sharon	1,775	32	1	3	0	36	2.03%
Shelton	16,146	254	40	118	82	494	3.06%
Sherman	1,831	0	1	6	0	7	0.38%
Simsbury	9,123	289	63	86	0	438	4.80%
Somers	3,479	146	7	33	0	186	5.35%
South Windsor	10,243	443	57	186	12	698	6.81%
Southbury	9,091	90	7	31	0	128	1.41%
Southington	17,447	499	62	317	54	932	5.34%
Sprague	1,248	20	12	24	1	57	4.57%
Stafford	5,124	257	20	115	0	392	7.65%
Sterling	1,511	0	6	21	0	27	1.79%
Stonington	9,467	441	19	79	2	541	5.71%
Stratford	21,091	524	425	344	33	1,326	6.29%
Suffield	5,469	296	6	48	15	365	6.67%
Thomaston	3,276	104	5	97	0	206	6.29%
Thompson	4,171	151	13	42	0	206	4.94%
Tolland	5,451	127	12	95	3	237	4.35%
Trumbull	13,157	315	19	82	315	731	5.56%
Union	388	0	0	6	0	6	1.55%
Voluntown	1,127	20	1	22	0	43	3.82%
Wallingford	18,945	354	142	296	35	827	4.37%
Warren	811	0	0	1	0	1	0.12%
Washington	2,124	17	2	3	23	45	2.12%
Waterford	8,634	213	33	239	0	485	5.62%
Watertown	9,096	205	33	216	0	454	4.99%
West Hartford	26,396	643	852	320	250	2,065	7.82%
Westbrook	3,937	140	5	29	29	203	5.16%
Weston	3,674	0	2	6	0	8	0.22%
Westport	10,399	265	60	2	63	390	3.75%
Wethersfield	11,677	705	109	258	0	1,072	9.18%
Willington	2,637	160	6	35	0	201	7.62%

Wilton	6,475	158	9	14	51	232	3.58%
Windsor	11,767	154	288	420	26	888	7.55%
Wolcott	6,276	313	14	174	0	501	7.98%
Woodbridge	3,478	30	8	3	0	41	1.18%
Woodbury	4,564	60	4	27	0	91	1.99%
Woodstock	3,582	24	0	28	0	52	1.45%
	1,487,891	93,840	48,102	26,989	5,406	174,337	



## STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING

LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.  
GOVERNOR

HENRY S. SCHERER, JR.  
COMMISSIONER

TO: All Interested Parties

FROM: Sandy Bergin, Supervisor  
Research Unit

DATE: March 13, 1993

SUBJECT: Affordable Housing Appeals Procedure  
Percentages of Assisted Housing Units

The current list of percentages of assisted housing by municipalities is attached.

The units counted for the purpose of this list are (1) assisted housing units - housing which is receiving, or will receive, financial assistance under any governmental program for the construction or substantial rehabilitation of low and moderate income housing, and any housing occupied by persons receiving rental assistance under chapter 138a or Section 1427f of Title 42 of the United States Code; (2) Ownership Housing - currently financed by Connecticut Housing Finance Authority mortgages or (3) Deed Restricted Property - deeds containing covenants or restrictions which require that such dwelling units be sold or rented at, or below, prices which will preserve the units as affordable housing, as defined in section 8-39a, for persons and families whose income is less than or equal to eighty percent of the area median income.

Some municipalities may notice a change in the total number of assisted housing rental units. These changes were caused by a double counting of Rental Assistance program certificates particularly for elderly units. The error has been identified and corrected.

The 1992 Estimated Housing Units column has been updated using the 1990 Census and adding the number of building permits issued since the Census was taken. It should be noted that because not all permits issued become units, some municipalities may notice decreases in the total number of units.

If you should have any questions about the information, please call Gail Perotti at 566-1805. This information is also available in large print or on audio tape by contacting Christopher Cooper at 566-1715.

sb/gep  
attachment



## Affordable Appeals List: 1992

Municipality 1992 Est Hsq Units Family Assisted Rental Elderly CHFA Mortgages Deed Restricted Percentages

Towns which are exempt under Section 1(f) of P.A. 89-311

Ansonia	7,568	855	164	154	14.2%
Bloomfield	7,969	396	390	346	14.2%
Bridgeport	57,012	7,047	2,706	2,312	21.2%
Bristol	25,198	1,397	828	1,072	13.2%
Brooklyn	2,440	100	169	61	13.6%
East Hartford	21,342	1,659	778	783	15.1%
East Windsor	4,133	367	124	88	14.0%
Enfield	16,696	759	363	899	12.1%
Groton	16,732	2,761	491	460	22.1%
Hartford	56,223	12,951	2,268	1,971	30.6%
Manchester	21,921	1,633	356	702	12.3%
Malden	24,897	2,091	801	1,010	15.7%
Middletown	18,291	2,137	814	469	18.7%
Naugatuck	12,078	630	298	466	10.7%
New Britain	32,313	3,278	1,201	1,239	17.7%
New Haven	64,205	8,473	3,651	1,973	26.3%
New London	11,969	1,157	577	256	16.6%
Norwich	16,510	1,568	765	628	17.9%
Plainfield	5,414	270	174	225	12.4%
Putnam	3,824	239	223	73	14.0%
Stamford	44,567	3,954	1,425	432	13.0%
Torrington	16,345	715	509	607	11.9%
Vernon	12,777	1,246	570	356	17.0%
Waterbury	47,520	4,919	1,958	2,160	19.0%
Winchester	5,119	363	120	125	11.9%
Windham	8,757	1,376	400	195	22.7%

Towns which are not exempt under Section 1(f) of P.A. 89-311

Andover	1,017	0	24	47	7.0%
Ashford	1,605	5	0	49	3.4%
Avon	5,794	2	39	34	1.3%
Barkhamsted	1,360	17	0	26	3.2%
Beacon Falls	2,038	0	0	27	1.3%
Berlin	6,376	3	70	102	2.7%
Bethany	1,616	0	0	5	0.3%
Bethel	6,473	36	124	110	4.2%
Bethlehem	1,286	0	48	5	4.1%
Bolton	1,724	0	0	32	1.9%

## Affordable Appeals List: 1992

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>1992 Est Hsg Units</u>	<u>Assisted Family</u>	<u>Rental Elderly</u>	<u>Mortgages CHFA</u>	<u>Deed Restricted</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Bozrah	892	1	0	22		2.6%
Branford	13,253	151	172	120		3.3%
Bridgewater	748	0	0	1		0.1%
Brookfield	5,423	1	35	68		1.9%
Burlington	2,489	18	0	29		2.5%
Canaan	591	6	0	9		6.1%
Canterbury	1,596	52	0	46		5.0%
Canton	3,351	16	114	98		2.0%
Chaplin	798	0	0	16		2.6%
Cheshire	8,773	21	148	59		2.8%
Chester	1,428	0	23	17		2.6%
Clinton	5,450	2	78	59		5.6%
Colchester	4,341	46	72	123		2.1%
Colebrook	627	0	0	13		4.0%
Columbia	1,808	1	24	48		0.2%
Cornwall	829	0	0	2		7.6%
Coventry	4,033	0	80	228		5.3%
Cromwell	5,125	0	147	123		9.6%
Danbury	26,147	1,036	963	485	24	1.3%
Darien	6,691	53	30	1		1.2%
Deep River	1,825	0	0	22		7.6%
Derby	5,295	247	106	51		1.6%
Durham	1,993	0	0	31		5.6%
East Granby	1,734	0	72	25		3.0%
East Haddam	3,426	1	36	65		3.9%
East Hampton	4,314	3	70	94		7.7%
East Haven	10,777	316	120	392		3.7%
East Lyme	6,990	55	94	112		0.5%
Eastford	627	0	0	3		0.0%
Easton	2,250	0	0	0		9.3%
Ellington	4,624	216	42	173		2.1%
Essex	2,754	2	36	21		2.0%
Fairfield	20,326	140	223	53		4.2%
Farmington	8,861	219	80	64	6	2.5%
Franklin	677	0	0	17		5.7%
Glastonbury	11,230	247	295	86		0.5%
Goshen	1,311	0	0	6		3.4%
Granby	3,536	12	81	26		4.2%
Greenwich	23,649	529	423	3	33	8.8%
Griswold	4,264	91	60	224		1.8%
Guilford	7,883	19	90	30		1.6%
Haddam	2,656	0	22	20		

## Affordable Appeals List: 1992

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>1992 Est Hsg Units</u>	<u>Assisted Family</u>	<u>Rental Elderly</u>	<u>Mortgages CHFA</u>	<u>Deed Restricted</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Hamden	22,352	704	561	291	2	7.0%
Hampton	618	0	0	9		1.5%
Hartland	704	12	0	9		3.0%
Harwinton	1,905	0	20	24		2.3%
Hebron	2,597	1	25	60		3.3%
Kent	1,437	0	24	4		1.8%
Killingly	6,624	258	163	93		7.8%
Killingworth	1,965	3	0	5		0.4%
Lebanon	2,499	1	24	66		3.6%
Ledyard	5,290	6	30	277		5.9%
Lisbon	1,425	0	0	75		5.3%
Litchfield	3,498	20	78	19		3.3%
Lyme	1,014	0	0	0		0.0%
Madison	6,676	0	72	8		1.2%
Mansfield	5,256	123	140	96		6.8%
Marlborough	1,939	0	0	31		1.6%
Middlebury	2,385	0	0	17		0.7%
Middletown	1,607	0	30	19		3.0%
Milford	20,490	268	425	215		4.4%
Monroe	5,736	1	30	1		0.6%
Montville	6,477	12	80	338		6.6%
Morris	1,109	1	20	5		2.9%
New Canaan	6,958	94	0	0		1.4%
New Fairfield	5,151	0	0	61		1.2%
New Hartford	2,367	8	0	34		1.8%
New Milford	9,684	5	102	171		2.9%
Newington	11,689	151	181	175		4.3%
Newtown	7,427	0	96	47		1.9%
Norfolk	909	6	28	6		4.4%
North Branford	4,736	0	60	63		2.6%
North Canaan	1,439	69	40	11		8.3%
North Haven	8,357	0	130	52		2.2%
North Stonington	1,879	0	0	35		1.9%
Norwalk	32,365	1,799	603	526	39	9.2%
Old Lyme	4,400	0	24	29		1.2%
Old Saybrook	5,128	11	36	37		1.6%
Orange	4,620	0	0	1		0.0%
Oxford	3,020	1	34	11		1.5%
Plainville	7,473	140	144	326	4	8.2%
Plymouth	4,600	10	94	157		5.7%
Pomfret	1,298	0	0	11		0.8%
Portland	3,358	132	70	37		7.1%

## Affordable Appeals List: 1992

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>1992 Est Hsq Units</u>	<u>Assisted Family</u>	<u>Rental Elderly</u>	<u>Mortgages CHFA</u>	<u>Deed Restricted</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Preston	1,717	0	40	43		4.8%
Prospect	2,734	0	0	24		0.9%
Redding	3,014	0	0	0		0.0%
Ridgefield	8,137	45	94	8		1.8%
Rocky Hill	7,240	167	70	111		4.8%
Roxbury	893	0	0	0		0.0%
Salem	1,272	0	0	34		2.7%
Salisbury	2,489	28	0	3		1.2%
Scotland	470	0	0	8		1.7%
Seymour	5,965	81	120	74		4.6%
Sharon	1,611	22	0	7		1.8%
Shelton	13,254	8	260	102		2.8%
Sherman	1,478	0	0	9		0.6%
Simsbury	8,311	0	110	33		1.7%
Somers	2,785	0	54	30		3.0%
South Windsor	8,291	10	70	243		3.9%
Southbury	7,017	0	24	17		0.6%
Southington	14,500	451	329	309		7.5%
Sprague	1,127	1	20	24		4.0%
Stafford	4,383	110	110	169		8.9%
Sterling	939	5	0	37		4.5%
Stonington	8,004	71	140	108		4.0%
Stratford	20,281	905	310	359		7.8%
Suffield	4,432	0	110	53		3.7%
Thomaston	2,789	7	89	95		6.8%
Thompson	3,661	17	98	43		4.3%
Tolland	3,869	1	30	109		3.6%
Trumbull	11,200	1	222	22		2.2%
Union	295	0	0	4		1.4%
Voluntown	921	1	20	47		7.4%
Wallingford	16,219	318	185	345		5.2%
Warren	604	0	0	1		0.2%
Washington	1,886	4	0	5		0.5%
Waterford	7,435	0	40	265	2	4.1%
Watertown	7,668	26	161	195		5.0%
West Hartford	25,098	466	541	163		4.7%
West Haven	22,752	849	637	764		9.9%
Westbrook	3,259	47	60	28		4.1%
Weston	3,306	0	0	0		0.0%
Westport	9,860	82	50	3	44	1.8%
Wethersfield	10,846	140	514	7		6.1%
Willington	2,335	2	0	67		3.0%



## Affordable Appeals List: 1992

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>1992 Est Hsg Units</u>	<u>Assisted Family</u>	<u>Rental Elderly</u>	<u>Mortgages CHFA</u>	<u>Dead Restricted</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Wilton	5,884	0	85	1		1.5%
Windsor	10,400	98	152	297		5.3%
Windsor Locks	4,956	129	100	194		8.5%
Wolcott	4,988	0	108	149		5.2%
Woodbridge	2,878	1	0	3		0.1%
Woodbury	3,513	0	48	16		1.5%
Woodstock	2,678	0	24	27		1.9%
Connecticut	1,335,478	73,724	34,552	30,631	300	10.4%